

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 11, 17, 1-4 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lai. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kim.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 based on the first step ("determining...") not being readily supported by the specification. The Examiner has also objected to claims 8 and 9 based on the their respective limitations not being readily supported by the specification.

In response, Applicant submit that regarding claim 1, the step of determining whether the digital signal processor is under tracking control can be found at page 5, line 25 to page 6, line 1 and, also, as S104 in FIG. 6. In addition, the limitations of claims 8 and 9 can be found at page 5, lines 7-18.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections in light of the above cited disclosure.

Claim Amendments and Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for noting that claims 12-16 would be allowable if written in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant has amended claim 11 to include the limitations of claim 12, respectively.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 2, as well as including the "second low-pass filter" recited in claim 12, thereby incorporating the allowable subject matter of claim 12 into claim 1 (even though claim 12 does not depend from claim 1). Furthermore, no art has been cited against claims 8 and 9. Applicant has also chosen to cancel claims 2 and 12.

As a result, all claims now recite allowable subject matter. Therefore, the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 103(a) are rendered moot and no response is deemed necessary.

Furthermore, in the event the Examiner does not consider the allowable subject matter of claim 1 to be effectively incorporated into claim 1, Applicant submits that neither by Lai et al. nor Kim teach or disclose "said digital signal processor comprises a first low-pass filter used under tracking control and a second low-pass filter used under non-tracking control to generate said radio frequency ripple signal central level." It follows from the above that the cited art does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicant's claims and, thus, cannot support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

In addition, neither Lai et al. nor Kim disclose, or suggest a modification of their specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed method. Accordingly, Applicant hereby respectfully submits that no combination of the cited prior art renders obvious Applicant's amended claims.


Summary

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 7, 2007

By:


Demian K. Jackson
Reg. No. 57,551

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 40144